Remarks/Arguments:

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claim 1 is pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the diaphragm is disposed on and in contact with the suspension holder at an inner circumferential end of the suspension holder such that the diaphragm is supported by the suspension holder. Basis for the amendment can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 2-13 and Figs. 1 and 2 of the subject specification.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,394,913). It is respectfully submitted, however, that this claim is patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

> ... a diameter of an inner circumference of the suspension holder is greater than an outer diameter of the voice coil body while a diameter of an inner circumference of the diaphragm is greater than the diameter of the inner circumference of the suspension holder ...
>
> ... the suspension holder has an inner circumferential portion which is disposed on a top surface of the supporting section and is coupled via an adhesive to the voice coil body ...
>
> ... the diaphragm is disposed on and in contact with the suspension holder at an inner circumferential end of the suspension holder such that the diaphragm is supported by the suspension holder. (Emphasis Added)

Matsuda et al. disclose, in Fig. 2, speaker 10 including speaker cone 8 and damper 2 that are secured to voice coil bobbin 3 with adhesive A. Damper 2 is placed between frame 1 and voice coil bobbin 3. Speaker cone 8 is coupled to a leading end of voice coil bobbin 3. (Column 2, lines 29-32 and lines 41-56). Speaker 10 also includes damper ring 11 fitted around and fixed to a portion of voice coil bobbin 3

behind the coupling positions to damper 2 and speaker cone 8. (Column 2, lines 53-56).

Matsuda et al., however, do not disclose or suggest that a diaphragm is disposed on and in contact with a suspension holder at an inner circumferential end of the suspension holder such that the diaphragm is supported by the suspension holder, as required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Instead, Matsuda et al. teach that speaker cone 8 is disposed above damper 2 and coupled to damper 2 via adhesive A (col. 2, lines 41-46 and Fig. 2). Accordingly, speaker cone 8 is not in contact with damper 2. Thus, Matsuda et al. do not include all of the features of claim 1.

Applicants' claimed loudspeaker provides advantages over the speaker of Matsuda et al. As shown in Applicants' Fig. 2, Applicants' claimed loudspeaker includes a diaphragm 3 that is disposed on and in contact with suspension holder 6 so that both diaphragm 3 and suspension holder 6 are coupled to supporting section 12. The supporting section 12 itself is coupled to voice coil body 2. Thus, diaphragm 3, suspension holder 6 and voice coil body 2 form a rigid body. Because a rigid body is formed, rolling motion of the voice coil body can be suppressed while the diaphragm is allowed to move freely, and can attenuate a harmonic content (page 4, lines 2-13 of the subject specification). In contrast, speaker cone 8 of Matsuda et al. is disposed above damper 2 and is coupled to damper 2 via adhesive A. Accordingly, speaker cone 8 is not in contact with the supporting section and, thus, cannot form a rigid body (including speaker cone 8, damper 2 and voice coil body 3). Accordingly, Matsuda et al. do not include the advantages of Applicants' claimed loudspeaker.

On pages 2-3 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner agrees that Matsuda et al. "does not explicitly teach exact relative dimensions for the suspension (2), voice coil body (3), and diaphragm (8)." However, the Examiner asserts that "it does not matter that the feature shown is unintended or unexplained in the specification." Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants note that proportions of features in a drawing are not evidence of actual proportions when drawings are not to scale. (MPEP § 2125). Because Matsuda et al. are silent regarding any limitations for the diameters of damper 2, voice coil bobbin 3 and speaker cone 8 (shown in Fig. 2) and are also silent on the drawings being to scale, the diameters of damper 2, speaker cone 8 and voice

coil bobbin 3 may not be relied upon. Accordingly, Matsuda et al. cannot disclose or suggest that a diaphragm diameter is greater than a suspension diameter and that a suspension diameter is greater than a voice coil diameter, as recited in claim 1. Thus, Matsuda et al. do not include all of the features of claim 1.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

DMG/fp

Dated: March 6, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

FP_405387